



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,341	05/13/2005	Huib Maat	W&K005US	8374
7590		11/28/2007		
Paul Grandinetti				
Levy & Grandinetti				
Suite 408				
1725 K Street NW				
Washington, DC 20006-1419				
			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, DINH Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/510,341

Applicant(s)

MAAT, HUIB

Examiner

Dinh Q. Nguyen

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34,36-47 and 49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-5,8-18,20-34,36-41,44-47 and 49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6,7,19,42 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/26/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 3-5, 8-11, 13-18, 20-34, 36-41, 44-47, and 49 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected Species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on September 17, 2007. However, claim 12 is withdrawn from further consideration for depending on the withdrawn claim 11.
2. Applicant's election with traverse of Species in the reply filed on September 17, 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Species disclose the key element of unity of the membrane. This is not found persuasive because in the specification and drawings, the Applicant has disclosed the different technical features that are associated with each Species as described by the Examiner in the Requirement for Restriction dated August 15, 2007.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 7 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 7 and 49 recite the limitation "the

microporous membrane" in lines 1 and 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 19, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin et al.

Martin et al discloses a device 10 comprising a base 12 with at least one volatile active agent 14 housed in a reservoir, at least one wall of which comprises a wicking membrane 16 that is fusion to the reservoir (see column 3, line 66).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6, 7, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. in view of Young et al.

Martin et al. teaches all the limitations of the claims except for a matrix of linear ultrahigh molecular weight polyolefin, a very large proportion of finely divided particulate

siliceous filler, and a high void content. However, Young et al. discloses a matrix of linear ultrahigh molecular weight polyolefin, a very large proportion of finely divided particulate siliceous filler with a high void content such as Teslin®. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Martin et al. with the microporous membrane such as Teslin® as suggested by Young et al. Doing so would provide a way for dispensing a volatile material.

Furthermore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the device of Martin et al. with a matrix of linear ultrahigh molecular weight polyolefin, a very large proportion of finely divided particulate siliceous filler, and a high void content, because Application has not disclosed that the matrix of linear ultrahigh molecular weight polyolefin, a very large proportion of finely divided particulate siliceous filler, and a high void content provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to show the art with respect to a device for dispensing a volatile material: Kunze et al, and Gordon et al.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinh Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4907. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00-4:30.

Application/Control Number:
10/510,341
Art Unit: 3752

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Dinh Q. Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3752

dqn